

23 OCT 1973

MEMORANDUM TO: Director of Personnel

SUBJECT : [REDACTED] Request for Extra Leave Allowance
STATINTL
STATINTL

1. The attached package concerns a request by [REDACTED] for extra allowances in connection with his retirement. It comes as an initial request--as distinguished from an appeal contesting a turn-down for something requested earlier--and we do not feel that it requires the Director's attention or signature at this point. As you will note, OGC also does not feel the Director should sign it.

2. I have spoken with [REDACTED] who agrees the Director should be spared this sort of correspondence. It is our feeling that it more properly should be handled by your office. I trust this is agreeable with you.
STATINTL

STATINTL

[REDACTED]
Deputy Inspector General

Attachment
As Stated Above

OPC 73 1943

Office of Personnel
P. O. Box 1925
Washington, D.C. 20013

STATINTL

24 OCT 1973



Your letter of 30 July 1973 to the Director inquiring about the inclusion of the post differential on your lump-sum leave payment has been read with interest and forwarded to this office for reply.

We wish to assure you that the delay in responding to your letter was necessary because of the time required to research and review regulations applicable to your inquiry. Our General Counsel conducted the review, and it has been determined that, at the time of your retirement, 1 April 1973, Agency regulations did not provide an authorization for including the post differential on lump-sum leave payments. The policy to pay the differential to employees as part of the lump-sum leave payment was adopted by the Agency on 10 May 1973. This policy became effective on that date and does not apply retroactively.

My best wishes to you for the future and I regret that our response could not be favorable.

Sincerely,



Acting Director of Personnel

STATINTL

STATINTL

DDO/DC/EA/PERS

Rewrite: OD/Pers/

Original and 1 - Addressee

1 - ER

1 - DDO

1 - OGC

4 October 1973

(24 October 1973)

1 - CEA

1 - CEA/Personnel

1 - D/Personnel

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET				
SUBJECT: (Optional)				
OGC SUBJ: ALLOWANCES				
FROM:		EXTENSION	NO.	
CEA		6145	DATE 4 October 1973	
TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	DATE		OFFICER'S INITIALS	COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)
	RECEIVED	FORWARDED		
1. OGC	25 OCT 1973			
2. 				
3. PEG File				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				

USE ONLY

CONFIDENTIAL

SECRET

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM:		EXTENSION	NO.
CEA		6145	DATE 4 October 1973
TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	DATE	OFFICER'S INITIALS	COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)
	RECEIVED	FORWARDED	
1. CAG			STATINTL
DDO	10 OCT 1973		
2. [REDACTED]	10 OCT 1973		
3. OGC	10 OCT 1973		
4.			
5. IG	17 Oct 73	23 Oct 73	
6. D/PERSONNEL			
7. DGI			
8.			
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			
13.			
14.			
15.			

In reply to [REDACTED] we have prepared a letter for Mr. Colby's signature which informs [REDACTED] that his appeal has been denied. This letter is attached herewith.

The position taken by EA Division to deny [REDACTED] appeal is based on an OGC opinion outlined in OGC 73-1744, copy attached to the reference. Also attached to the reference is a copy of a [REDACTED] to the Vietnam Station providing [REDACTED] an interim report on his letter to Mr. Colby.

3 to 5: I fully concur with the thrust of the letter to [REDACTED]. However, I question whether this should be presented for the Director's signature. It seems to me that either the IG or Personnel, or even OGC, should sign rather than the Director.

John S. Warner
Acting General Counsel

SECRET

CONFIDENTIAL

USE ONLY

UNCLASSIFIED